

THE WOMEN

31

the shepherd's honour is touched. In numbers and quality sheep are the prerequisite of prestige. He is aware of their dependence on him and of the dependence of his whole family on what the flock is able to supply. He knows each animal, its history, and peculiarities. There is an extensive descriptive vocabulary of sheep terms. Skilled shepherds do not count their sheep, they scan them, recognizing at once the absence of an animal identified by a particular combination of markings, colours, and idiosyncrasies. Sick sheep are tended with care and compassion. A shepherd may sleep with the animal under his cape to give it warmth. He is neither gentle nor sentimental towards his sheep but between the man and his animals there exists an evident solidarity.

3. THE WOMEN

Women and goats are conceptually opposed to men and sheep. Goats are unable to resist pain in silence, they are cunning and insatiate feeders. Greed and cunning are important characteristics of the Devil and Sarakatsani will often say that although Christ tamed these animals the Devil still remains in them. Sarakatsani keep some goats to exploit that part of their grazing land which is unfit for sheep. But as animals they are despised, and a stani with too high a proportion of goats to sheep loses prestige. Women are not, of course, simply creatures of the Devil but the nature of their sexuality which continually threatens the honour of men, makes them, willingly or unwillingly, agents of his will. It is consistent, therefore, that in the practical division of labour women rather than men care for the goats. Although it is unfitting for women to graze these animals, they alone are responsible for building the goat-pen, for cutting and carrying to the pen the branches of tender leaves to wean the kids, often for watching the kids in the first days when they graze without their mothers, always for milking the goats, for carrying the milk to the cheese-maker, for shearing their fleeces, and for collecting and sacking the goat dung which is sold to the villagers.

Conversely, women, particularly married women involved in sexual intercourse, or girls during their menstrual periods, do not approach the sheep unnecessarily. A woman is careful not to cross directly in front of a flock, partly for the practical

6/2
829 being obliged to take him into consideration before proceeding to some course of action.

6/2 Consultation between trusted kinsmen about their various affairs is continual. The enterprise itself may be of almost any kind, the marriage of a son or daughter, a decision whether or not to sell sheep to raise money for the payment of a debt, or the acceptance or non-acceptance of an offer of winter pasture. Similarly, when a man is involved in some crisis, a fight with another shepherd, a brawl at a marriage feast, or a difficult court case, kinsmen come to him of their own accord with advice and criticism. In this way he learns which courses of action will enjoy the moral support of his kin and which will not. And since a man loses prestige if his kinsman acts wrongly, he will always exhort him to an honourable course of action however difficult the circumstances. For his part, the principal actor is influenced by the fear of losing the support of his kinsmen, as he may do if he takes decisions which lose him prestige. His kinsmen can then only protect their own prestige by isolating themselves to a greater or lesser degree from social contact with him. Consequently this consultation between kinsmen is not only to a man's advantage in terms of his own prestige, but it is also a subtle sanction for right ways of acting in the community as a whole.

6/2
476 In economic matters, too, a shepherd looks to his kinsmen for help and co-operation. Quite apart from the deep distrust which divides unrelated persons, shame prevents a man from seeking assistance outside the kindred, since this would be a tacit admission that he had been rejected by his own kinsmen. Thus

[426] sentiment and convention lead in the same direction. A shepherd lives from one monetary crisis to another. When he needs a small money loan for an operation fee at a Jannina hospital or for the expenses of a wedding, he is often unable to persuade a merchant to grant him an additional advance; but he seldom fails to raise it from his kinsmen if they have the money in hand. Economic co-operation may take other forms. The condition of the family's flocks is not only the basis of its physical existence but the source of pride and prestige. A man fears to meet the appraising eyes of another if his animals are in a meagre and spindle-shanked condition. But grazing, both in the Zagori and in the winter pastures, varies considerably from

BROTHERS AND THEIR WIVES

69

community. A man who, although married and a parent, remained for a number of years under the day-to-day direction of an elderly father, however vigorous, would lose prestige and find himself the butt of comic satire. The fact that the younger married brothers work for a time under the direction of an elder brother in a common household is a different matter. The relations of brothers after marriage are based on free association. Policy decisions are a matter of consensus rather than direction. The suspicion against the man who does not relieve his father of his burden of responsibility (whether he wants to be relieved of it or not) is that he is nervous, diffident, lacking in self-assertion, and unable to be a 'capable protector' (λαυός προστάτης) of his family.

In summary, then, the first phase of the development of the elementary family is a latency period in which conjugal solidarity, although gradually developing, is subordinate to the sibling solidarity between the husband and his brothers and sisters. In general it may be said to last until the birth of the first child. Also, although there is no formal change in the relation of father and eldest son during this period, competitive friction between them tends to increase.

2. BROTHERS AND THEIR WIVES

After one or two years most brides have become mothers. This, naturally, brings about a great change in the bride's position in the extended family. Previously, although full membership of the group was extended to her, yet in an affective sense she remained a stranger even in the eyes of her own husband. After the birth of her first child it is said that the new bride 'takes root in the new family'. Not only does she take root, as it were, in the extended family but more significantly the new elementary family, consisting of herself, her husband, and the infant child, takes a definitive form. The arrival of the child is received with joy by the whole extended family whose attitude towards the bride shifts from tolerance to acceptance and affection for her as the mother of their tiny kinsman.

It is from the moment when the members of the extended family first feel this new affection for the bride that their control over her begins to diminish. So long as the extended family remains undivided and a younger brother of her husband does

BROTHERS AND THEIR WIVES

77

Theodorina, the wife of Theodoros, is criticized because of 596
 her lack of physical robustness. About three years ago she lost 597
 a baby girl. She was prostrate with grief and never fully re- 159
 covered. She has been to a number of different doctors who [65]
 have agreed that she is suffering from 'weakness' but have
 variously diagnosed this as due to infected tonsils, bad heart,
 and anaemia. She has had her tonsils and adenoids removed [287]
 and a number of courses of injections; this treatment has cost a
 considerable sum of money and has produced no visible im-
 provement. Demetrina, the wife of the second brother, is par-
 ticularly scornful of Theodorina. 'Theodorina is down on the
 ground (κατά γῆς) again', she complains, and goes on to explain
 that she is leaving her children in the ditch to fend for them-
 selves just because of an idea in her head. This refers to her
 grief for her little girl. It is right to grieve, but not to this extent
 where she is unable to care properly for her sons and daughters
 for whose existence she ought to thank God. No doubt what
 really annoys Demetrina and the other women is the money
 wasted on medicines, and the extra work which they have to do
 when Theodorina periodically says she is too sick to go about
 her tasks.

Demetrina, herself, is disliked by all the other wives and her
 mother-in-law because of her sharp tongue and her dogmatic
 holier-than-thou attitude. Her own family of origin is on the [602]
 worst of terms with her husband's brothers and she is suspected,
 not without reason, of passing on information about the conduct
 of affairs in the extended family into which she has married.
 She is a storm centre in many quarrels with the other wives on
 account of her four-year-old son, an unpleasant and physically
 tough blonde-headed bully, who maltreats his young cousins by
 hurling stones and hitting them over the head with pieces of
 wood. They note that this child resembles his maternal kin.

The third wife, Eleutherina, is a good worker but graceless 596
 in body and personality. She suffers from some catarrhal com- 598
 plaint which makes her speech almost unintelligible and causes 159
 her nostrils to drool with mucus. Behind her back the other 932
 wives mock her for these defects and she is conscious of this.
 Her small son Alec, who is four years old, suffers from the same
 catarrhal complaint, appears to be mentally backward, and is
 subject to periodic fits. She is held responsible for the disabilities [55P] ●
 of the child which affect the prestige of the whole family.

THE EXTENDED FAMILY

596 with the competitive values. On the other hand, two factors
 577 have been noted which tend to hinder the young shepherd
 554 from attaining the status of head of household as soon as might
 otherwise be the case. First, an eldest son must show respect to
 his father and accept his leadership as long as he is physically
 active and capable; or until the son is about thirty years of age.
 This is another way of saying that normally an eldest son cannot
 take a wife and expect to be in charge of family affairs until he
 is about thirty years of age. Secondly, brothers, although
 married, must remain as a united extended family until their
 sisters are safely married. This, of course, reflects the original
 unity of the sibling group. Thus, so far as respect and obedience
 towards an active father, or the unity of the sibling group
 (which are both important values of the kinship system), delay
 the young shepherd from assuming the role of a head of house-
 hold, the kinship system and the competitive values of the
 community are in some measure of conflict.

4. THE 'COMPANY' OF RELATED FAMILIES

474 It is some consolation to brothers who may feel a genuine
 233 distress at the necessary development of their relationship, if
 after the dissolution of the extended family they continue to
 manage their sheep together in a 'company'. It is also a prac-
 [594] tical convenience since the elementary family is not, normally,
 the sheep management unit in the winter unless it happens to
 possess at least 200 sheep and the services of four active shep-
 herds. As we have seen in chapter two, the Sarakatsani prefer,
 in winter, to divide their sheep and goats into a number of
 different flocks. Where grassland is natural and scarce, the
 advantage of this division is that the optimum use is made of
 the pasture offered by any particular stretch of country. The
 [427] lower limit of 200 sheep follows from the difficulty of renting
 very small areas of grazing from village communities. Also it is
 [558] damaging to the pride of a shepherd if he is seen standing on
 watch over a flock of only forty or fifty 'zigouria', 'sterpha', or
 [464] 'galaria'. Nevertheless, if poorer families with less than a hun-
 [235] dred animals are unable to find or persuade kinsmen to accept
 them into their 'company', they are forced to work during the
 winter as wage shepherds for villagers, or occasionally for richer
 Sarakatsani, a situation which emphasizes their poverty and
 suggests the inadequacy of their kindreds.

Zagreb

609 not shown the right attitude of a man under obligation. This,
 578 in a sense, is true. For neither side can admit to obligation with-
 [558] out losing prestige; and both must attempt to claim the super-
 ordinate position in a creditor-debtor relationship.

612 But a man does not feel any embarrassment in asking for help from a kinsman. In these circumstances there is no shame in being under obligation or a debt of gratitude. Irrespective of the state of the balance of favours and counter favours, collateral relatives of the same generation, by reason of their kinship, are conceptually equal since they are descended from a pair of siblings who, before marriage and apart from the chances of age and sex, were socially equivalent persons. A man does not
 [557] lose prestige through obligation to a kinsman; on the contrary his reputation is increased, for the community pays attention to a person whose kinsmen lend him immediate and effective support. And for the man who gives aid to his kin, the knowledge that men learn of his actions through the gratitude of the kinsman who receives it, is sufficient recompense. For in this way he wins a reputation as a man of honour 'who supports his kinsmen'. If through wealth or influence a man is in a position to act as a general protector of his kindred, not only is he expected to do so, but this, in most cases, is also his wish. There is some altruism here. A man takes pleasure in the company of his kinsman; he finds him on occasion a source of practical advantage, but in particular he holds to him and has confidence in him simply because he is a kinsman. And for these reasons complaints of ingratitude against kinsmen are relatively few.

612 But although a man is under a moral obligation to help a
 627 collateral relative, this assistance is not given unconditionally. The important consideration is that it must not conflict with the interests of the family. This emerges very clearly in situations of physical violence. A man is not expected to accept responsibility for avenging the death of a collateral kinsman. He will give moral support to the family of the victim but he is unlikely to go
 [682] farther than that. A vengeance killing leads to the arrest of the killer and a prison sentence, which is sometimes followed by self-imposed exile in another district of Greece when there is any fear of counter vengeance. In this way a shepherd's family might lose its protector at least for some years, perhaps for ever. Only in unusual circumstances where a man feels that his

612 *The proverb,*
578 'Why is the wound in your eye so deep? Because my kinsman
539 gouged it out' (γιατί τὸ μάτι σου βαθειὰ βγαλμένο; — γιατί μοῦ
τὸ βγάλε δεινός), expresses precisely this difference.

612 Between kinsmen who co-operate in a 'company' for the co-
474 management of their flocks it is almost inevitable that from time
578 to time differing interests produce a coolness in their relations.
Yet it is remarkable how seldom these frictions develop into
the kind of quarrel which causes an irreparable breach. A stern
self-control is maintained by these kinsmen on their injured
feelings because they know that they depend on each other's
assistance in the struggle to survive the hazards, natural and
political, which surround them. However, any form of dis-
honesty in their co-operative handling of the flocks destroys the
[685] basis of their association. Recently a cousin who was herding his
sheep with a 'company' of married brothers was discovered
during the lambing season in the act of trying to attach a
number of his kinsmen's newly born ewe lambs to his own ewes,
and his own male lambs to the ewes which he had robbed.
Inevitably, after such an incident, the trust between these kins-
men was permanently broken.

835 Incest (απομιξία) represents the most dramatic form of decep-
612 tion that one kinsman can practise on another. Unmarried
605 cousins of opposite sex enjoy an easy, friendly companionship
with one another which they are denied with unrelated persons.
Very occasionally a youth succumbs to the temptation of sexual
experiments with a young kinswoman, an act in which he may
destroy both the girl's honour and his own. It seems most un-
likely that these affairs, if protracted, can ever remain secret in
a community where there are so many questioning eyes. Over
a period of ten years I discovered three probable instances, of
which one was incest between first cousins. In this case a youth
605 was staying in his uncle's house and there, it seems, seduced the
558 unmarried daughter. The cousin had left his uncle's house before
it became apparent that the girl was pregnant, and he naturally
denied from a distance that he had had any hand in the matter.
The girl for her part claimed that she had been impregnated
by divine, not human, means, but little attention was paid to
this suggestion. The girl's family did not take any drastic action
[684] in the matter beyond disposing of the child when it was born.
'The girl herself was allowed to live; and in fact, a year or two

THE EFFECTIVE KINDRED

111

The girl herself was allowed to live; and in fact, a year or two later was married off to a poor widower who extracted a considerable dowry in consideration of her blemished history. Although the girl had an unmarried brother no action was ever taken against the alleged seducer. The family claimed that it would not be right to kill a first cousin (any more than a brother) whatever the crime committed, and there are those who agree that there was some force in this argument. But there are others who do not hold this view and believe that the family made a virtue of a dishonourable preference. In any case the family emerged from this affair with its honour destroyed. Needless to say, all forms of social intercourse have ceased between the kinsmen concerned. This involved the destruction of the relationship between the brothers who were the heads of the two families. Incest between first cousins is a sin, for the same blood turns in upon itself in the pollution of sexual intercourse. It is something which goes against nature and something also which inevitably wrecks the whole scheme of kinship relations.

Sexual intercourse between second cousins is still described as incest but it cannot be said in quite the same way that it is an act which goes against nature. Second cousins are kinsmen but they are, also, nearly 'strangers'. Men know that in the towns the Church, from time to time, solemnizes marriages between second cousins, and that in two notorious instances in recent years such marriages have even been contracted by Sarakatsani. But so far as premarital sex relations are concerned the choice here lies between calling them incest or fornication. Whichever term is chosen to describe the liaison, it is less an unnatural sin than conduct of the deepest dishonour. As one man put it with ironic scorn, 'It would be better to marry your own sister' (καλλίτερα νά στεφανωθείς την αδερφή σου). But although an illicit affair between second cousins is serious enough, for it inevitably destroys the girl's honour and the relationship between the two parents who are first cousins, it does not have quite the same catastrophic consequences for family and kindred relationships as incest between first cousins.

It is clear, then, that where there is a flagrant breach of the norms of kinship, the relationship is annulled. The trust which is the basis of kinship relations is an axiomatic value in Sarakatsani life which is never questioned. From the injured kinsman's point of view there can be no extenuating circumstances which

THE EFFECTIVE KINDRED

113

two previous occasions he had more wisely confined his attentions to gipsy women. His family was in any case poor and of low prestige. There was nothing at all to be said in his favour. He had a number of kinsmen among the Sarakatsani who graze the lands of the same village, and of these the closest was Evangelos Balatsos, a first cousin. Evangelos and the other kinsmen all joined in the universal condemnation of Nasios. During the weeks which followed Evangelos made a point of going each day to the home of Nasios and unnerving him with imaginary accounts of the plots and ambushes which the husband of Mitrina was preparing to lure him to his death. So thorough were his efforts that for the next two months, until the Sarakatsani left for the winter pastures, Nasios was never seen outside his hut in daylight. Evangelos after his daily visits to Nasios made his way to the coffee-shop where he described to an appreciative audience the state of affairs in Nasios's household, how he remained each night, sleepless behind the door with axe in hand, and how his wife was obliged under cover of darkness to remove his faeces from the hut. In this fashion Evangelos took a leading part in the shaming of his kinsman, and saved his own name by denying solidarity with his kinsman and damaging his reputation.

The possibility of losing the moral and practical support of kinsmen, perhaps for ever, is clearly a most powerful sanction of the norms of kinship behaviour and the values of the wider community. If Nasios, a poor man who herded the sheep of villagers, had possessed a substantial flock and had therefore been dependent on the help of kinsmen in a 'company', this estrangement from his kinsmen would have affected him even more seriously than it did. It is also evident that the application of this sanction by the kinsman is itself sanctioned by the threat that a man and his family may lose prestige if he does not temporarily abandon the evil-doer. Since the interests of the family always take precedence over obligations of individual collateral kinship, there is never any doubt that a man will conform. We see, not for the first time, the connexion between prestige values and the isolation of the family; for these values necessarily threaten the solidarity of any personal relationship or social grouping which may conflict with a man's duty to uphold, or promote, the prestige of his family.

612 management, are the cousins least likely to form those impor-
 605 tant links of devoted friendship. Since marriage is patrilocal it is
 the fathers of these cousins who experienced the various con-
 straints of life in an extended family. These considerations do
 not generally apply to the other categories of first cousin who
 [572] normally live in other neighbourhoods. It is among these rela-
 tives that a man finds his intimate friends. For these cousins are
 able to emphasize in their behaviour the altruistic qualities of
 collateral kinship, particularly in the performance of free
 favours. Various considerations, then, tend to identify the in-
 terests of collateral kinsmen, others to set them apart. We may
 612 look at this from another point of view. The fact that for any
 571 individual the community is divided into the opposed categories
 of kinsmen, 'own people', and non-kinsmen, 'strangers', is
 clearly a factor which unites people who can trust one another
 against the rest of the world who are not to be trusted. Generally,
 a man can only co-operate with a kinsman, find a true friend
 among his cousins, talk to an unmarried girl who is a kins-
 woman, and so on. However, the members of a man's kindred
 are not undifferentiated. Some are close kinsmen, others more
 distant. There is not quite the same measure of responsibility
 and obligation to a second cousin as there is to a first. Moreover,
 as children grow up their parents are more concerned with
 their own descendants and less with collateral kinsmen. But,
 quite apart from any considerations which relate specifically to
 the internal structure of the kindred, questions of prestige are
 [558] always a potential threat to the solidarity of kinsmen. Kinsmen
 are identified in the thoughts of outsiders and if one man loses
 prestige, whether it is due to moral error, poverty, or physical
 deformity, his kinsman suffers with him. In these circumstances
 his only defence is to withdraw temporarily or permanently
 from the relationship.

Sarakatsani are fully aware of the fragmented character of
 [578] their community. They realize that one man's hand is turned
 against another's. They continually lament the distrust which
 exists between unrelated men and the element of calculation
 which must exist even in the relations of kinsmen who co-
 operate at work. They value their relations with kinsmen who
 [1259] live in other neighbourhoods not only for the various practical
 reasons we have elaborated, but because of the generally

582 elsewhere,' the Sarakatsani say. The restriction on the marriage
602 of close affines, associated with the prohibition on marriage in
the kindred, forces those who are searching for prospective
brides always to look outside the circle of well established
relationships.

582 Indeed this examination of affinal relationships has largely
602 turned on the various correlates of the prohibition on marriage
612 in the kindred. We have seen that a man must marry a person
who, in effect, was formerly an enemy, and that the element
of hostility never entirely vanishes from the affinal relationship
although a common interest in the children of a marriage
produces and sanctions a degree of co-operation between
affines. The marriage prohibitions symbolize and divide off
a category of social relations based on trust. Those people with
whom marriage is permitted are, on the other hand, suspect.
The prohibitions clearly set apart non-kinsmen, 'strangers',
from kinsmen, 'own people', and the two opposed behaviour
patterns which are proper to each of these categories of
relations. Affinal connexions compose a third interstitial
category of social relations with persons previously strangers
to whom a man is related through the contract of marriage of
himself or a kinsman. In the opposition between kin and non-kin
they tend to be assimilated to the latter category when the
practical consideration is one of trust or confidence, and to the
former when it is a question of the possibility of co-operation.

582 The marriage prohibitions prevent alliances in the kindred
602 which would in some degree reverse the process of isolation from
612 collateral kinsmen. They also force each family to regard un-
554 related families as potential affines. In this analysis of Sarakat-
san kinship the importance of prestige values has been con-

- [558] constantly emphasized. If men of standing will not marry the
daughters of a family or give their own in marriage to its sons,
the prestige of this family must inevitably fall. The kind of
marriage a man or woman makes is an index of prestige and
at the same time is a very important element in the future
reputation of the new family they are establishing. Therefore
marriage prohibitions while they contribute inevitably to the
relative isolation of a man from his collateral kin, not only have
the consequence that marriages establish co-operative re-
lationships between previously opposed family groups, but

593 Publicly a husband addresses his wife in a stern severe voice. Requests are commands, barked out in sharp phrases. It is important for a man's self-regard (*tywtomós*) that other men should see that he is master in his own house. In public the wife is meek and modest, silent and submissive. She does not smile at him or laugh with him before strangers. But in the seclusion of the hut matters are otherwise. She abandons the mask of expressionless humility and discusses with her husband all the affairs of the family, putting forward her own suggestions in a respectful but fearless fashion. Yet even here respect is implicit and a wife must never use tones of mockery or abuse towards her husband.

Obedience to her husband is a moral imperative for the wife.

[626] She will not be excused by public opinion, however badly she may have been treated by the man. She cannot refuse to co-

593 habit with him sexually. Conversely, the act of disobedience

839 by which she damages her husband most severely is adultery.

558 In adultery she makes her husband a cuckold (*xepatās*), one

who wears a horn. 'She puts horns on him' (*toū bázei xépara*), it

is said. The implication that the cuckold wears a horn may be

[684] an ironical allusion to the sexual potency which his wife's

action suggests he does not possess.¹ Adultery attacks the moral

integrity and honour of the family and makes a laughing-stock

of its leader and head. Thus, Sarakatsani always insist that if

a husband surprises the guilty parties in the act, he must first

kill his wife and then her seducer. The axiomatic acceptance

of family obligations, the uncompromising character of the

sanction, and the extreme difficulty of conducting such a liaison

secretly, are all factors which contribute to the extremely low

incidence of adultery. Indeed, since 1950, there appears to

have been only one clear and unambiguous case of discovered

adultery.

593 The disobedience of the wife in the sense of flatly refusing to

do the spoken bidding of her husband is also rare. This situation

or the mutual irritation which arises over the 'trivia' of com-

munal living results in the wife receiving a beating with a stick.

The Sarakatsani of both sexes accept the right of a husband to

strike a disobedient or erring wife. It is also true, however, that

men who are continually beating their wives (and certain men

¹ Cf. Pitt-Rivers, *op. cit.*, p. 116; and Onians, *op. cit.*, p. 243.

PARENTS AND CHILDREN

139

already arisen between them, and from that age she is expected ⁸⁸²
 in front of strangers to show him respect by standing when he ⁵⁷⁷
 sits and helping her mother to wait on her father and his ⁵⁹³
 guests. By the time a girl is seventeen there is a noticeable
 neutrality of tone in her conversation with her father. She is
 careful to avoid any reference to sexual matters or the possi-
 bility of her marriage. They are both conscious of the categorical
 obligations they owe to one another and the severe penalties
 which sanction their fulfilment. If a father does not arrange ⁵⁸¹
 an honourable and successful marriage for his daughter, his ⁵⁸⁴
 reputation in the community is diminished. If a daughter ⁵⁵⁸
 does not preserve her virginity and her reputation for virginity, ⁸³⁶
 she faces death possibly; or, should she avoid this fate, she must ⁶⁸⁴
 certainly endure dishonour and a dishonourable marriage to a
 widower or a poor man of ill repute. Although between puberty
 and marriage a daughter receives almost all her instructions
 from her mother, her father, to whom she is subordinate both
 by reason of sex and generation, remains the ultimate source of
 authority.

* * *

At thirteen, when a boy leaves school, he generally begins ⁸⁸²
 his working life as a goatherd. He comes at once under the ⁸⁹³
 direction of his father who in his role of leader and co-ordinator
 of the family labour group exerts a stronger authority over the
 boy than he has yet experienced in his relations with his father.
 A son is now careful to show his father respect. Occasional
 lapses in correct behaviour towards a father are not taken too
 seriously while a boy is still at school. He is, then, still a child
 and is in an obvious sense under the power and instruction of
 his father and the school teacher. He cannot, however rebellious
 his nature, become independent at this stage. The boy leaves
 school at an age which coincides approximately with the onset
 of puberty and at the same time he becomes a full and responsible
 working member of the family under his father's leadership.
 He still offers no threat to his father's position as leader, yet
 his sexual maturity and the responsibilities of his new status in
 the family foreshadow the inevitable retirement of the father
 shortly after the marriage of his eldest son. The firm authority
 exerted by the father at this stage, and the required attitude of

882 respect from the son, serve to dissuade the latter from any
 593 attempt at precocious self-assertion. And it protects a man from
 the ridicule of his equals; for if a youth answers his father's
 remarks or instructions in a rude or argumentative fashion,
 other men smile with satisfaction and say that already 'the boy
 is acting as family head' (τὸ παιδί κάνει τὸν τοῦ ἐγγρά).

882 The respect of the son is a general attitude which accepts the
 593 authority of the father as right and legitimate. A son shows his
 576 respect for his father by carrying out conscientiously the
 instructions he is given. If he is under the age of twenty, he
 does not smoke or drink ouzo in his father's presence. Similarly,
 he does not swear or make coarse remarks or jokes about
 sexual matters before his father. If a youth is sitting in the

[295] village coffee-shop when his father enters, he unobtrusively
 [577] gets up and leaves. Drinking, smoking, and playing cards in the
 coffee-shop are the social activities of those equal in status, and
 are therefore incompatible with the respect owed by a son to

884 his father. After a young man returns from his military service,
 593 when he is about twenty-three years of age, he will begin to
 596 drink and smoke with his father at home, a step which he
 295 generally takes at the express invitation of the father. The son
 [701] no longer has occasion to leave the coffee-shop, but this is be-
 cause a father knowing his son to be there stays at home or, in
 a large village, goes to another shop; the son, similarly, avoids
 giving embarrassment and showing disrespect to the father by
 entering the shop if he knows he is there. If the son is in the shop,
 the father understands that it is unfair to expect him to leave.

[568] After his return from military service, the young man becomes
 a member of the 'pallikari' group^a of fully adult but unmarried

[577] men of the community. When he is not with the sheep, he is
 expected to show himself in the forum of the coffee-shop, to
 give periodic proof of certain outward signs of his manliness
 by drinking, smoking, arguing, and by general self-assertion.
 • [559] He cannot do these things in front of his father, without
 diminishing his father's honour and his own prestige.

593 The idea of an adolescent or adult son striking his father is

^a Nowadays this consists of the young unmarried men who have completed their military service, that is of unmarried men between the ages of 23 and 30. The ideal type παλλικάρη is the hero warrior unencumbered with family responsibilities.

⁵⁹⁶ for these arrangements, ¹is public opinion. ^{The sanction} However reluctant a man may be to hand over the reins to his son, he knows that he will lose less personal prestige by moving into retirement than by attempting to hold power against the conventions of customary usage. He is also aware that any temporizing over this problem will lead to the kind of friction with his son that is unlikely to remain private and may result in a further loss of prestige for the whole family.

⁵⁹⁶ There are two other circumstances which may help to persuade a father to cede his position at the customary time. ⁵⁹³ Grazing land in summer for a herd of three hundred sheep and ²³³ goats represents a considerable area of mountainous country. ⁴⁶¹ The journey from the huts of the family near the village to the farthest limits of the summer grazing is very often a walk of two or three hours, climbing steeply the whole way along difficult rock-strewn paths generally no wider than a rabbit's track. Such a journey two or three times a week for a man in his early sixties, which is the age a father is likely to have reached when his own son approaches the age of marriage, is a severe physical strain. But if the family head is not physically able to see for himself the condition of the grass and the state of his animals, his shepherd sons cease to treat his instructions or criticisms with any seriousness, and in respect to animal management virtually arrange matters for themselves. From this point it is a short step to question the father's authority in other matters. Physical or mental feebleness of the father is invariably the explanation of a son assuming control of family affairs at an early age.

⁸⁸⁶ The second circumstance has to do with the relation of the family to the outside world. With few exceptions the shepherds ²¹² who are today over sixty years of age are illiterate. Under ¹⁷⁸ modern conditions these men are at an obvious disadvantage in understanding the content of government agricultural regulations and in filling up the increasing number of printed forms. Unlike their more sophisticated and literate sons, men of this age group do not understand the ways of minor officials. 'They don't know how to go about things in the offices' (δὲν ξέρουν τὰ γραφεῖα), their sons explain. In part, the prestige of letters is attributable to the idea that they are the necessary weapons for a successful resistance or adaption to bureaucratic

² i.e. the taking over of family author. ² b.
--- Analysis

PARENTS AND CHILDREN

163

administration. It is easy to understand that if the head of the family must be constantly asking his young son to read, explain, and advise on all written documents, he finds it difficult to maintain his authority until his son has reached the customary age of marriage. Significantly, the sack in which the business papers and account books are kept has become in recent years a symbol of the authority of the head of family, who alone has the right to open it. 596
212
178
[457]

In the majority of cases, however, these two circumstances, although they may cause difficulties, do not force or even allow a father to hand over executive control much earlier than custom demands. If, for example, a father of fifty-nine hands over the control of family affairs to a son of twenty-six, he will undoubtedly be considered a man of weak character even where it is known that he suffers some physical disability. He must, for reasons of personal and family prestige, attempt to assert and exercise his authority. Sons are not unaware of the father's position and difficulties. During the last years of a father's exercise of power a degree of rivalry between a father and his sons is always present, but because fathers and sons, together, accept responsibility for the prestige of the family, they guard most carefully against any public expression of their differences. 586
596
626
558

After the eldest son assumes control, the father continues to do such work as he is capable of. It is generally a task of his own selection and the senior son is careful to avoid giving direct instructions of any kind to his father. There are always a few sick sheep or late lambs which need to be grazed close to the huts, and occasionally he will spend a day with one of the flocks to relieve a son. In some families with many sons, where there is no essential task for the old father to perform, he will create some activity to occupy his time. The old father of John Charisis daily saddles and exercises a favourite horse. When visitors ask where the old father is, his sons reply with affectionate but patronizing smiles that he is out with his horse again. The visitors join in the laughter at the old man's expense and the sons do not take offence, for this is a general attitude to old people in the community. They are respected if they have led honourable lives, yet in relation to present preoccupations they are unimportant. The old father always expresses his views 596
887
593
596
888
[887]

PARENTS AND CHILDREN

169

beyond the second year. Each morning at dawn, each evening⁵⁹³ at dusk, during these long years she sings her dirges and⁷⁶⁵ lamentations again. Even when the period of mourning is completed, she will never again dance at a festival, or sing a ballad, during the remaining years of her life.

If the role of the mother expresses the solidarity of the⁵⁹³ family, its honour and integrity largely depend on her virtue. A⁸³⁴ mother who is thought to have lost her virginity before⁵⁵⁸ marriage or, afterwards, to have been guilty of adultery, or even an apparent inclination towards it, infects her children with the taint of her dishonour, and however closely these children may conform to right ways of behaviour, they cannot retrieve the reputation of their family.

Although the honour of a woman is so intimately connected⁵⁹³ with the disciplining of her sexual activity as to be almost⁵⁷⁷ synonymous with it, any lapse from social rectitude also affects⁸³⁴ her honour; for it is argued that if she fails in the one respect, she is very likely to fail in other and more critical situations concerned with her sexual virtue. The wife of Costas Pistiolis is a woman who cannot restrain her laughter. It is held against her that 'she always jokes and never talks with seriousness'. This is an attitude unbecoming to a married woman of modesty with children and responsibilities, for it betrays a lack of self-discipline. Her family is, in any case, poor and despised. She ought to be conscious of so many worries that laughter should be impossible for her. It is insulting to suggest to a young man that he might consider marrying the daughter of this family. The girl, Chrysanthé, is acknowledged to be modest, comely, and hard-working. But it is pointed out that, although there is no positive evidence of sexual misconduct on the part of the mother, her uncontrolled and unwomanly behaviour makes the possibility of this not unlikely. And despite the seeming virtue of the girl Chrysanthé, the fact that she is the daughter of such a woman leads a man to await with some confidence the time when serious moral faults in her character will be discovered. Thus, upon the honour of the mother depends the honour of her children in a sense which logically precedes the mutual responsibility which members of a family in their conduct bear at all times for the reputation of the family. A brother can take some action to cleanse the dishonour of a sister, either against

593 the sister herself or her seducer, but a son is unable to do
 597 anything to wash away the stain of his mother's dishonour.
 [834] The role of the father in the elementary family is concerned
 with leadership and representation of the group to the outside
 world. The management of the flock, the handling of money,
 and the arrangement of matches, fall within his sphere of
 activity and upon his successful manipulation of these affairs
 depend his own prestige and that of his family and its descen-
 dants. For these reasons a father must be an 'able' protector'
 (εὖως προστατής). He must at least be able to provide his
 • [558] family with food, clothing, and shelter. A man who fails in this
 duty forfeits any respect in the eyes of the community; he is
 heedless of his obligations, depraved, lost (χαμένος). But to be
 accepted as an 'able protector' demands more than this. A
 man must be a skilful shepherd and a shrewd bargainer,
 possess friends in the right places, and be of sufficient wealth
 to sustain honourably his family responsibilities. Above all,
 he requires the quality of manliness (ἀνδριεύς), to guard the
 honour of the family from rape or insult, and by his general
 behaviour in public to uphold the prestige of the group.

593 The father's duty of protection is balanced by his right to a
 position of authority. This is legitimate by reason of social
 convention, and is sanctioned by public opinion and in the
 early years by the simple fact of power. Children acknowledge
 the father's authority by their attitude of careful respect. And
 from this position the father is able to discipline them into
 accepting important social values, and to co-ordinate their
 various activities in the family's labour force. But the attitude
 of respect towards a father also prevents any precocious
 assertion of authority by a son which would damage his
 father's reputation, and place father and son in open com-
 [47] petition. The fact that all economic resources are owned
 corporately by family groups presents a problem for the method
 of succession to wealth and status in the community, a problem
 which inevitably causes difficulties between members of
 proximate generations in the same family. We have seen that
 by the time a son is approaching the age of thirty less deference

* I translate εὖως as able or capable, but it also indicates 'One who suffices, one who is able to provide', specific meanings which are significant in the present context.

SIBLINGS

173

person to redress the wrongs of rape and homicide. The solidarity of siblings is also passive, in the sense that the loss of prestige suffered by an individual on account of his evil or dishonourable acts equally affects his siblings. Therefore, the individual is responsible to his brothers and sisters for whatever he says or does. Only in the context of a vengeance killing do siblings generally escape the liabilities of passive solidarity; for the brother of a homicide is not generally considered to be a legitimate surrogate as an object of vengeance for the victim's family.

The emotional identification of siblings has its origin in the common experiences of early childhood. As children they sleep under the same blanket and eat from the same bowl. Older siblings look after the younger ones and protect them from the bullying of other children. There is an unthinking trust and loyalty. It is rarely possible to persuade an unmarried sibling to pass even a mildly adverse comment about a brother or sister. Usually personal secrets are not entrusted to anybody but a sibling of the same sex. Sisters discuss their fears and hopes of marriage, a subject which it would be shameful to mention even to their mother. Brothers share each other's anxieties about personal animosities and imagined insults.

The sympathy and emotional identification of sisters emerge with poignancy on the day of a girl's marriage. The unmarried sisters whom the bride leaves behind display a grief which in its public aspect is certainly conventionally expected, but for some days after the wedding they seem even within the privacy of the family hut to be stunned by the loss of their sister's accustomed presence. Sisters sense the dread and apprehension which the bride herself feels when she leaves the protective circle of her family to be given into the care of strangers. The violent shock of the sexual assault is also in their thoughts.

Unmarried brothers work together in service to the family flock. They are conscious that the physical survival of the family as well as its prestige depend in the last resort on the animals. This common dependence and service to the flock is another ground for their close identification. They do not work (as is the case in the co-operation of cousins or married brothers with separate households) with one eye on their partner to make sure that he is not shirking his share of the work. The mutual

THE SOLIDARITY OF THE FAMILY

189

corporate family, stand as equals in relation to the common flock and the common property. Strictly speaking, the son does not inherit property from his father; rather the father and the son both have claims on the corporate property which they exercise when they leave the group or when the group is dissolved. Through their dowries, the daughters also have parallel claims, and should a daughter remain unmarried she too will receive something, a half share, with which, like her parents, she passes into the family of her youngest brother. The partition of the corporate property and the single household does not come about so much as the result of individuals claiming individual rights, as through the redeployment of the resources of one corporate family group to endow and accommodate the needs of a number of new corporate families which, in part, are sprung from it. That this process of growth cannot be contained within the framework of a single corporation with continuity through time, is a consequence of the bilateral kinship system.

The authority of the head of the family group is limited in a number of ways. In the early years, before the maturity of his children, the authority of the father is unquestioned, but in the administration of family affairs his position, even then, is that of trustee rather than master and owner. A father who squanders the wealth of his family through gambling or inattention to his duties is despised. If the community discovers that he punishes his wife and children too harshly, or without reason, he will lose prestige. In the later years of the family's development when the father holds his authority over adult sons and daughters, and *a fortiori* during the period when the elder brother presides over an extended family group, the head of the family increasingly exercises an authority which is based on a process of collective decision and unanimity. During these years, for instance, the family head does not buy or sell stock or other property without consulting his sons or brothers. Through discussion, in which everybody participates, a collective viewpoint about conduct and action emerges, and the family is prepared to continue a debate for many hours until unanimity is reached. As opinion begins to harden, the remaining dissenters give way out of loyalty, if not from conviction. So tightly drawn to one another in the mutual

596 of opinion is likely to be favourable to a policy of inaction but
 577 mutual avoidance. There is, inevitably, some loss of prestige
 627 but this may be the lesser of two evils. But mutual avoidance
 626 (which is possible in this dispersed community) is essential. If
 ● [558] the killer were to appear before the victim's brothers on a public
 occasion, such as a wedding or a festival, the humiliating con-
 frontation would force the brothers to kill him or forfeit their
 honour. Generally, both sides have strong motives to keep out
 of each other's way. In the case of the vengeance killing between
 the Achnoulas and Stratos families, after some months the
 Stratos family may have felt relief that they did not know the
 identity of the killer. But the incident at the wedding was
 generally interpreted as a display of public boasting by George
 Achnoulas, and this made retaliation almost inevitable.

596 The loss of a life in a killing is seen as a loss of blood, and for
 577 this outrage the violator ought to pay with his own blood. We have
 627 shown that there is no passive solidarity in vengeance killing;
 a man does not generally suffer for a killing committed by his
 brother. This is a convention which plainly restricts the possible
 extensions of a vengeance killing and prevents a number of
 families from losing their 'protectors'. It is the analogue of those
 qualifications of active solidarity that we have already dis-
 cussed. However, this does not detract from the importance of
 active and passive solidarity in other situations nor the sig-
 nificance of the shedding of the common blood. This is very
 evident in fights which do not involve homicide.

596 An evenly contested fight in which no blood is spilled is an
 577 episode complete in itself; a fight of similar character and pro-
 598 portions in which one side physically loses blood but the other
 629 does not, inevitably provokes its own sequel in the attempt at
 some later time to draw blood from the opponent. But a man
 does not himself revenge the outrage which has been committed
 on him. This is the task of a brother or son. Also, the object of
 vengeance need not be the original opponent; any male
 member of this man's family is appropriate. In a typical dispute
 over the boundaries of grazing areas, Aristoteles was cut about
 the head by the other shepherd's crook. Some weeks later,
 Christos, the brother of Aristoteles, found himself at a wedding
 feast opposite the brother of the man who had recently quar-
 relled with his own brother. In his own words, 'I suddenly saw

Zagori

202 THE FAMILY AS A CORPORATE GROUP

596 the greater manliness. In the second category, however, where
 597 an affair concerns the sexual honour of a woman, the community
 627 strongly upholds the 'right', in an ethical sense, of a family to
 684 kill a man who has assaulted one of its women. For this act is
 626 evil and dishonourable. An avenger in an affair of the second
 category does not generally go into exile, since his life is to a
 degree protected by public opinion. Where a balance is struck
 between the two groups in affairs of family honour, it is in-
 herently less stable in cases of the first category than in those of
 the second. And this appears in the fact that two families, be-
 tween whom there is a killing and an exile, are extremely care-
 ful to avoid meeting in circumstances where their presence may
 represent an affront to one another. Mutual avoidance is a
 means of preventing the disturbance of a precarious equili-
 brium. It appears, then, that the processes of vengeance pro-
 vide through exile a sanction against killing, and through
 vengeance killing a sanction against breaches of the code of
 sexual behaviour.

596 When a man is killed or a woman is assaulted something, a
 599 life or honour, is taken away, not merely from the violated
 629 individual, but more importantly from his family. One group
 has committed a wanton and hostile act upon the other, and
 between the two groups a debt of honour now exists. Something
 has been taken, something equivalent must be taken back.
 Until some kind of a balance is re-established, the victim's
 family is in the eyes of the community inferior to the group of
 the violator, even where the act of outrage, as in the case of
 sexual assault, is in itself evil.

It is a peculiarity of 'affairs of honour' that they consist of at
 least two events between which some interval of time elapses.
 The first is the violation of family honour which is generally an
 outrage on one particular member; the second is the act of
 vengeance which is similarly performed, in most cases, by one
 member only. In both instances the individual as victim or
 avenger represents his family. If the honour of the individual
 and the honour of the family are analytically separable, in
 action they are one. And if the execution of vengeance brings a
 measure of personal glory to the individual, at the same time
 it is also an act which is essentially altruistic.

● [557] The longer the interval of time between the two events the

HOSTILITY BETWEEN UNRELATED FAMILIES 205

less effective is the response. To some extent this is so even ⁵⁹⁶ where the reasons for delay are physical: for instance, the killer ⁵⁷⁷ is in prison, or the avenger is not yet adult. But it is said that if ¹²⁷ an affront to honour remained unanswered over a period of ⁶⁵⁸ years after an adult unmarried avenger was available and the killer physically present in the community, then the quality of the dishonour ascribed to the family would be such that an eventual vengeance killing would not reinstate the reputation of the victim's family. For, on grounds of damaging conjectures about the personal motives for this delay, other families would be able to continue asserting the relative integrity of their own honour by denying it to the family of the victim. The case is hypothetical since there has been no instance of this kind in recent years, but it is indicative of Sarakatsan thinking on this matter.

The defence of family honour is at once an indication of family solidarity and a process which recreates it. The honour of the family, the solidarity of this group, and the mutual responsibility of its members, are correlated notions. It is true that passive solidarity does not extend to questions of vengeance where a life is demanded, but in other respects it is complete. A man may suffer physical assault for the offence of his father, brother, or son. Further, if one member of a family acts dishonourably, all the other members of the family lose honour in the eyes of the community. If a man is killed or a sister's betrothal is broken, and the family remains inactive, all its members are equally dishonoured. Since all are responsible for the actions of any one, every member is accountable to every other member. All the members of the family necessarily form a single solidary group for the protection of their common honour.

2. HOSTILITY BETWEEN UNRELATED FAMILIES

In the preceding chapters we have seen that for each individual ⁶¹⁹ this community is divided into the two opposite but complementary ⁶⁰² categories of kinsmen and strangers; trust marking ⁶⁰⁹ relations in the one category, distrust in the other. Distrust prevents ⁵²⁸ co-operation between shepherds who are not kinsmen or affines, and the four or five men that are necessary to manage a flock are either father and sons or a co-operative 'company' of kinsmen and relatives by marriage. Moreover, the produce of the

^S
434
234
426
439
6
441
439
452
^S
296
291
358

these transactions secret from his cheese merchant but generally with only partial success. In April the shepherds hurry to meet the summer cheese merchants, conclude their agreements, and take an advance on their summer milk which for 200 ewes will be about £30. But this spate of spring revenue is often quickly dissipated in paying the heavy costs of winter pasturage, possibly of more legal wrangles, and sometimes of an Easter wedding. The celebration of Easter also brings its expenses. New shirts and shoes are bought for the family, cloth is sent to the tailors to be made up into new jackets and trousers. For if the family attends the Easter church service in old clothes it loses prestige. Also it is believed that at the service on Easter Saturday night each person ought to wear something that is new, to honour the resurrection of Christ.

About the middle of May the heads of shepherd families visit the merchant to agree with him the statement of their accounts. Money advances and the value of the flour issued are balanced against the value of the milk delivered to the cheese-making station. In an average year the result is generally a small profit or loss for the shepherd of perhaps £10 which is added to, or subtracted from, the total debt owed to the merchant. But in bad years when the grass has been poor, or many ewes have not produced lambs, the loss may be more substantial and this the merchant must bear if he does not want to force his client into selling his stock. If the shepherd is in difficulties, he may seek a further loan before leaving the plains. When the merchant grants this favour, the shepherd must accept a slightly lower price for his milk in the coming winter, about a farthing an 'oke' less than whatever proves to be the ruling rate for the next season.

^S
434
426

When the shepherd arrives in his summer village in Zagori, he will generally have some money in his pocket. He immediately pays off the greater part but not all of the debt which in most cases he left behind in the village shop the previous autumn. This may amount to £20-£30 in some instances. Having paid off part of this debt he is in a better position to ask for credit later in the summer when he may again become short of cash. In the same way he will pay off some of his debts to winter shopkeepers when he first reaches the plains in the autumn.

At the end of July the shepherd takes the balance of his

If a patron cannot
effectively protect his clients his prestige is diminished; and in his own community the client, too, suffers for the incapacity of his patron, since the potential of his strength from this source is seen to be less than was supposed. But when the protection is effective, both patron and client gain prestige from the relationship. The colleagues of the patron envy him the power which his control of a body of clients assures for him, other families in the client's community envy him his cleverness in winning powerful patrons. But the Sarakatsani client will not share with others the vicarious influence which patronage brings him, unless they are kinsmen or affines. For he believes that if he shares his advantage, he loses it. And this is a further reason why relationships across the boundaries of the community with persons of influence are exclusive and particular connexions established by the individual family.

We see that while the organization of administration stretches down, as it were, from the central Government towards the village community but loses power and the ability to take decisions the farther it extends from its point of origin, the structure of the system of patronage, which is based on social relationships between clients seeking for a man with the ability and friendship connexions to protect them and a patron who accepts these duties in return for political allegiance, grows upwards and through lawyers, other persons of influence, and Members of Parliament, is linked to the legislative assembly. Thus the organization of government and the structure of patronage are parallel hierarchies. At any particular level the two hierarchies are related through ties of friendship. The shepherd or villager is excluded from the Government hierarchy, but through the structure of patronage he may be able vicariously to submit his case before a senior official in the public service.

Patronage is the means through which the local community is linked to the wider national society. And it is significant that the group which seeks this connexion is the individual family and not the community. This is clearly the case amongst the Sarakatsani, but even villagers do not co-operate in seeking Government favour except where the interests of the whole village as such are attacked. If the President of a village is able to help a village friend by his influence in the town, he does so

266

THE VALUES OF PRESTIGE

In the local gathering of families which share the pastures of the same summer village the hierarchy of prestige is based upon a fairly precise knowledge of the genealogy, wealth, moral character, and conduct of each family; but, in the wider ordering of social reputations in the total community, elements of prejudice and speculation play a greater part.

In either case, there is more general agreement about the ordering of families at the two extremes, which define the hierarchy, than in its middle reaches. A number of families with the surname of Tsoumanis by their wealth and descent from a few dominating personalities of the past three generations are generally recognized to be the leading families of the community; these are the families of 'first lineage'. And certain of the families who bear such names as Tangas, Myriounis, and Ferendinos might be associated with them. On the other hand, families with the names of Sultanos or Pistiolis are assigned by general opinion to the lowest grade of social reputation; for them, indeed, social prestige does not properly exist. For the most part these families are economically poor and their genealogies lack any mark of distinction.

The positions at either end of the hierarchy are not only more clearly defined, they also possess a fixity that is absent elsewhere. A family with the surname Pistiolis possesses large flocks yet it remains a family of the 'lowest lineage'. Its daughters are virtuous but their hands have not yet been sought in marriage even by men of indifferent social standing. However closely such families may live in the spirit of the community's values others do not give them the just recognition of their merits, so that certain of their number lose heart and are no longer concerned to act honourably; for in their case virtue is not its own reward. And the evidence of this reaction supports the original evaluation of the community.

If it is scarcely possible for such a family to gain prestige, it is at least difficult for the leading families of the community to lose theirs. There are few instances where a member of a family of the highest lineage has failed in a 'question of honour'. If a man is naturally timid he finds it all the more difficult to resist the immense moral pressure of family and community to act as he is expected to act. At the same time membership of a leading family in itself protects the individual from gratuitous slights. It is true that if a family of wealth and high lineage

594
554
571
[558] prevent any of their number from moving in an upward direction. There is always the possibility of falling to the category of those who are last, but the absence of any great differences in wealth, and the value given to the struggle to protect personal and family honour, hold the majority of families to an unwilling recognition of their equality in prestige, which is seldom admitted in speech but is less precarious than it seems.

2. HONOUR

577 The social reputation, whether of a man or a family, is a composition of various elements, analytically separable in description but with greater difficulty in life. Among these it is convenient to begin with a consideration of the concept of honour (τιμή) since this is fundamental to any assessment of prestige. Indeed, it is doubtful if prestige may be said to exist in its absence.

The translation of this concept by the English word 'honour' is useful if it is remembered that the analogy is only approximate. In modern Greek usage τιμή is conferred as a sign of the recognition of the excellence or worth of a person. It becomes the respect or esteem owed to certain persons, for example, to the heroes of the Revolution. From the point of view of the receiver it is whatever raises him up in the eyes of another and gives him reason for pride. In other contexts it may indicate certain qualities or conditions on which the reputation of an individual, or a group, is dependent. More specifically, it refers to the sexual virtue of a woman. It also describes the monetary price, or value, of an object or service. The last instance points to the common element in these various contextual uses. Τιμή expresses the idea of worth, whether this is an economic value in a market, or social worth evaluated in a complex of competing groups and individuals. Most Sarakatsani would understand this range of use, but they restrict their own employment of this word to the three last instances.

577
571 Among the Sarakatsani the concept refers particularly to the honour of the individual and the family, these two points of reference rarely leading to any conflict of loyalties since the solidarity of the elementary family is so complete. The situations in which this honour is typically violated or betrayed have

HONOUR

273

Even in the most favourable circumstances loss of honour is ⁵⁷⁷ unlikely to be entirely remedied within the living memory of ⁵⁵⁸ those who know of the affair. A man whose family has lost its honour cannot in any real sense be said to possess prestige at all. People say of a man who has allowed his father's slayer to remain undisturbed in the same neighbourhood, 'We don't even say "good morning" to him'. In fact this is not true. People do greet him, but formally and without enthusiasm. He is occasionally seen in the coffee-shop, but he sits in a corner and little attention is paid to him. He is tolerated but his prestige is negative. Loss of honour does not mean direct social ostracism. The sanction is more subtle; it implies the withdrawal of full recognition or response.

Although honour is an essential prerequisite of prestige it ⁵⁷⁷ is not itself entirely independent of it. Families which on quite ⁵⁵⁴ different grounds, such as poverty, have no prestige and are ⁹³⁵ classed generally as 'lost' families (*χαμένες αξιογένητες*), are denied the imputation of honour even though no positive accusation of dishonour can be pointed against them. Quite small incidents, which are not in themselves exactly questions of honour, are seized upon by the community to show prospectively that such a family, if it were faced by the duty of defending its honour, would be found wanting. The family of Costas Pistiolis is very poor. In the Sarakatsan view there must always be something morally wrong with a very poor man, and given their system of values this is not difficult to understand. A poor man is dependent on others for employment, or favours, if his family is to survive. He is not in a position to insist upon an equality in honour which, in any case, the community will not allow him. One day I saw a youth pelting the little son of Costas with pieces of dung in his father's presence. Costas, however, could do nothing since the youth's father was an influential member of the co-operating group which only tolerated with difficulty the presence of the Pistiolis family among its number. Another witness of the little scene swore and told me that you could copulate with this man's daughter and he would stand by and hold your coat.

Any attack made on the family's honour demands an im- ⁵⁷⁷ mediate response. Failure to respond fatally damages the ⁵⁵⁴ prestige of the outraged group and all its members. Without ⁵⁵⁸

577 honour prestige is not possible. But also for those families, which
554 on other grounds have no prestige, honour itself is already lost.

3. THE HONOURABLE MAN: POSITIVE IDEALS

156
554 The number of roles which the individual is required or able
to assume in this community is limited, and some description
of these has already been given in earlier chapters. Whether
or not the individual fulfils the more general expectations of his
various roles is a further consideration in the assessment of
his prestige. Therefore, in this section I shall discuss certain
values and qualities which are associated with the different
complexes of roles that are appropriate for men and women at
[577] various stages of life. These are related to honour and the
concepts of manliness and shame but are not always entirely
consistent with them.

562
[561] Together with age, the division of the sexes is the significant
discriminating factor in the system of social roles. The two
opposed but complementary categories of persons that result
from this division provide both a division of labour and a pattern
of moral virtues and faults.

462 The division of labour is unambiguous but not rigid. Some
tasks which are normally performed by one sex are carried out
by persons of the other sex in an emergency. This does not
provoke criticism except where the reversal of roles becomes an

● [558] established feature of a family's working arrangements. A
family which day after day sends a twelve-year-old daughter
to herd goats will certainly lose prestige. There are, however,
a number of tasks which are never attempted by the other sex.
For example, women never milk sheep or use a shepherd's
crook; men almost never milk goats. Although men will lift
heavy objects to secure them to a mule, they never carry bur-
dens on their backs. However sick or feeble his wife or daughter
a man will never help her with the intolerable burden of heavy
[562] water barrels. These tasks have become diacritical symbols of
the two sexes; and to ignore them is to deny that one possesses
the essential qualities of one's sex, manliness or shame.

834
562 As we have seen in earlier chapters, companionship and
co-operation between people of opposite sex is possible only
within the family and the kindred. Outside these limits the
sexes (except in the case of the very old and the very young)

156
577
828
591 assume, ideally, a community in which all families are equal in their possession of honour, and all men are equal in the honourable discharge of the duties associated with their social roles. Although a Sarakatsanos seldom explicitly attributes prestige to another, and struggles always to find some failings in another's character when he discusses him, yet by the recognition that he gives another in public life, by the way he shares conversation and drinking companionship, he may implicitly admit him to a position of equality. A man may also talk or drink with a person he considers to be of inferior prestige, but there are fine nuances of attitude which make this difference between them very clear. If this evaluation of prestige is acceptable to the general community the man who is treated as an inferior will receive no public backing if he chooses to interpret this treatment as a slight, and reacts to it violently.

156
577
683
558 The flagrant breaking of social norms leads to the withdrawal of recognition and response, that is to a definitive loss of prestige. After it became known that Goulas had falsely denigrated the daughter of George Carvounis he appeared even more infrequently in public, an admission of his shame and humiliation. When he did enter the coffee-shop people greeted him unenthusiastically, if an exchange of greetings was unavoidable; but nobody engaged him in conversation, or bought him a drink. His presence was tolerated, but he was tacitly expelled from the intimacies of social life. He was no longer an equal in honour.

156
577
626 Conformity is the chief defence against denigration where people believe that the hostile criticism of others protects in some way their own reputation. Moreover the precision of this criticism is considerable since the social roles which a man or woman assumes at any period of life are few in number, and their implications are perfectly understood both by the protagonists and those who observe them. Yet it would be too simple a judgement to think that the concepts of honour and the honourable man depend only on the external sanctions of competition or mutual hostility. For the Sarakatsani believe that these ideals and values, which breathe meaning, purpose, and value into their lives, require no justification or sanction. They are a way of life, not a code of interdictions.

577 But even social conformity does not necessarily protect

Zagori

THE MATERIAL ELEMENTS IN PRESTIGE 299

own, but four children to provide for. As soon as people begin to calculate in this manner, the inadequacy of his personal wealth emerges, and to some extent his prestige falls. Men with no brothers who are forced to join the 'company' of a cousin or an affine gain some prestige and cover from the size of the co-operating group of which they form a part, but the size of their own flock is always very precisely appreciated by outsiders. The worst situation is that of the family head with only a few animals who is forced to become a wage shepherd to an unrelated man, since in this case poverty associated with dependence on a stranger destroys prestige. 59
554
556
(227)

Taken together, numbers and wealth are the necessary material foundation for high family prestige. They imply the independence of the family within the community, both economically in the sense that the group is viable (and possibly free of debt), and technically in that it has enough manpower to manage its flocks unaided. It suggests that the family will possess powerful patrons outside the community and that in the competition for winter pastures it will be in a better position to rent grazing land. A village generally prefers to let an area of reasonable size, and to negotiate with a prosperous group able to provide a steady and profitable flow of bribes and presents. (164)
235
558

Also, it is the family of wealth and numbers, with powerful patrons and sufficient winter grazing, that draws to itself a number of less fortunate kinsmen. The dependence and support of these men make the protecting family the nucleus of a co-operative association, extending yet further its strength, influence, and prestige. It attracts many passing visits from other kinsmen. Men do not often visit kinsmen of low prestige, since such association only draws attention to a relationship which is best forgotten: on the other hand, they take every opportunity to pay a call on a kinsman of position and repute, to cultivate a relationship that is a source of possible support in future misfortune and, of itself, brings a measure of vicarious prestige. 59
55
612
574

Men like Pistiolis, who are at the lowest level of the community hierarchy of prestige, seldom receive a visitor from one year's end to another. Indeed, the number of visitors that a family receives is generally a reliable index of its reputation. It is 59
554
556
574

59
554
556
594

always known in the neighbourhood when a family has had guests (μουσαφιρηδες); their quality, relationship, and the possible reasons for their visit are debated in detail by the other families. Comment is often caustic, but the very interest which is aroused is a recognition of the importance of the event. If a family of numbers and wealth entertains a patron from the town, this is a triumph which it enjoys to the full. Meat is killed and wine is bought. Largesse is demanded of the family which entertains many guests. And in some mysterious way neighbouring families discover the measure of generosity, or meanness, which a host has shown to his visitors; and criticism, encouraged by envy, will not spare him. In hospitality (φιλοξενια), a virtue in which the Sarakatsani believe they are naturally pre-eminent, there is always a strong element of competition.

[626]

554 (c) LINEAGE*

611

612

[551]

Νταμάρι, lineage, refers to the quality of the kindred relationships which a man inherits from both his father and mother; and the importance of this for prestige has already been discussed in chapter three. If he possesses the surname of one of the leading families, or is directly descended, preferably in the male line, from a famous tselingas of the last century, this also is a significant element in a man's reputation. It might appear to indicate that for the highest and the lowest families, at least, reputation of lineage is patrilineally inherited. There is, indeed, a bias in favour of relationships traced through the father (particularly agnatic relationships) in the evaluation of νταμάρι in all families, and this is certainly accentuated at either extreme of the hierarchy of prestige, where certain family names are associated with the idea of high or low reputation, but the inheritance of νταμάρι remains fundamentally bilateral.

[581]

[551]

[626]

[558]

In general, as we shall see in a discussion of marriage, men are careful to marry their sons or daughters into families of equal reputation. Where a member of a leading family takes a bride of markedly lower lineage, the community withdraws from the new family the recognition of the prestige associated with the husband's surname by the simple procedure of refusing to call

* Lineage, here, does not, of course, refer to a unilineal descent group but to the quality of pedigree through all lines of descent.

THE MATERIAL ELEMENTS IN PRESTIGE 301

him by this name, and substituting some nickname, or patronymic.

But the prestige of lineage depends itself on the attributes of wealth and numbers which have already been examined. It does not help a poor man to claim that his great-grandfather was a famous tselingas with two thousand sheep. It is true that a father, or grandfather, who had the necessary wealth to support the nobility of his line is a saving grace for those who have lost their flocks, but it is a small one. The children of a leading family whose wealth has vanished suffer the same fate as the children of a family whose father, although from a family of the 'first lineage', has married beneath himself, that is they literally 'lose' their name, the surname of the father. Lineage refers to prestige in the past, while the essence of competition in this community is concerned with influence in the present. Therefore, a 'name', without the means to support it, is not recognized.

This, in practice, is the mechanism that restricts the number of families that can successfully claim to be of 'first lineage'. Not all the collateral relatives of a leading family are recognized as equivalent in prestige, for without numbers and wealth they cannot aspire to this. And it is inherently unlikely that they will all possess these advantages. There are two important limiting factors. With the rule of equal inheritance between brothers, the size of the group of brothers which is necessary to build and protect wealth and prestige, itself is the cause, in the next generation, of the fragmentation of this wealth. The second factor is disease. Twenty years ago sheep-pox, and today liver-fluke, are diseases capable of decimating a flock within a short time. However honourable a man, the loss of his flocks must diminish his own prestige to some degree, and that of his children more seriously.

(D) MARRIAGES

Τὸ συγγενεῖός ἐστι τὴν ἀffinial relationship between two previously unrelated families. It is in the early days of summer that the families of men who wish to take wives in the following year begin to consider the question of finding suitable affines and, during these weeks, the gossip of the community is much concerned with news and speculation about matchmaking.

THE MATERIAL ELEMENTS IN PRESTIGE 303

a makeweight that balances various shortcomings in the bride whether these refer to the prestige ranking of her family, or to some personal inadequacy, or both. The virtuous daughter of Leonidas Gogolos was the victim of a road accident when she was a small girl. She walks with a limp, and her leg, below the knee, is pitifully thin and ugly with scar tissue. But it is generally believed that she will not remain unmarried if her father is willing to give her to a man of undistinguished family together with a dowry of 50 sheep. 581
583
554
198

In some instances brides are taken without dowry-wealth. Necessarily, marriages between poor families are generally contracted without dowry-wealth. And it sometimes happens that a family of wealth, when it takes a girl from a less affluent group, may, with a gesture of pride, waive the question of dowry-wealth. Pride, however, may also work in the opposite direction. A family of the 'first lineage' was asked for dowry-wealth of fifty sheep by a suitor of good repute. To show his wealth, to make plain the superiority of his family, and to place the groom under obligation to him, the father of the girl gave a hundred. 581
583
554

It is always said in general discussions of the matter that a girl who loses her honour, if she is not killed by her father, will never marry. The few cases of such women in the community do not support this statement. The wife of George Raftis was the daughter of a family of high repute. It is alleged that when she was a young woman she was seduced by a member of a wealthy and powerful Tsoumanis family which pastured its sheep on the land of the same summer village. The family did not dare to attack this powerful group, nor did they have the necessary resolve to execute the girl. Although the girl's family was of respectable lineage and some wealth, the loss of her honour and the inactivity of its men utterly destroyed its reputation. But finally, at the age of 39, the woman was sought in marriage by Raftis, a poor man of no standing, a wage shepherd with a handful of sheep whose wife had died leaving him with two young daughters. 581
583
584
558
[183]

Marriage to a widower is always a possibility for women whose eligibility for marriage is in some way anomalous. There is little prestige in marrying a widower, and the fathers of respectable families do not normally entertain the idea of 581
587
554

554 again, the dowry of the bride is formally presented ^{For pride,} article to the assembled guests, first at the bride's home, and afterwards at the home of the groom.

[585] The display of pride is an important element in prestige but it must itself be based on reality. The pride of a Sarakatsanos may always be disproportionate in the view of other men but when it is wholly false it leads only to mockery.

* * *

183 The elements of prestige have been divided into two categories. The first category emphasizes the ideal equality, in the 577 community, of families and individuals of the same sex and age 584 group. Their ideal equality rests on the belief that most Sarakatsani have honour and are honourable, that they struggle to achieve in their lives ideal patterns of conduct. These elements of prestige require of the individual man or woman constant effort and self-discipline. An idea of the essential nobility of the Sarakatsani underlies them. The second category of elements of prestige are factors which to a considerable degree lie beyond the power of the individual, or even the group, to alter. They are all factors (numbers, wealth, leadership of co-operating groups, opportunities to show hospitality, lineage, marriage alliances, and the effective display of pride) which far from positing the ideal equality of families lead inevitably to their differentiation in terms of prestige. And, necessarily, they are caught up in ideas of fate, envy, and the fallen condition of this world.

The two categories of elements of prestige are nevertheless interdependent and both must figure in the evaluation of a family's total prestige. Without the imputation of honour and the quality of being honourable, wealth and numbers only represent a prestige which is, at best, equivocal. And weakness, or poverty, draws in its train doubts about the honour of a family, however socially conformist it may be.

6. THE SANCTIONS OF PRESTIGE VALUES

- 156 One sanction for the conduct, qualities, and achievements
 ● 558 that have been presented as elements in the prestige of an individual, or a family, is the simple fact of the loss of this

THE SANCTIONS OF PRESTIGE VALUES 307

prestige, a withdrawal of recognition, a kind of social abandonment. But there are also important sanctions related to this withdrawal of social recognition which are internal to the social personality. I refer to the sentiments of self-regard (*ἐγωισμός*)¹⁵⁶ and shame (*ντροπή*). [557]

Fundamentally, self-regard is the inner necessity and obligation to achieve identity with the image of the ideal self. This image, of course, is a stereotype presented by society, there is little room for individual speculation, nor would it occur to most Sarakatsani to question its traditional content.

We have seen, in chapter seven, how a father instils in his children a sense of responsibility and loyalty to the family. They learn that in all their actions they are judged by others as representatives of their family, and that, therefore, they must compete and hold their own with other children of the same age and sex. A boy learns from songs and stories (and later at school) to identify himself with the values of the idealized heroes of the Revolution. He comes to believe in the super-human deeds of Katsandonis and Kolokotronis, and in the ability of men to repeat them where the cause has sanctity and men possess honour. ¹⁵⁶ [557]

At a more prosaic level he learns, from the interminable criticism of other people's failings, what conduct is expected of himself. The significant point about the image of the ideal self is that it is directed towards what must be positively achieved, that is to the ideal of a social personality with particular moral qualities but also certain material attributes. It is not concerned with a code of moral or ritual interdictions that simply must not be transgressed. Failure to achieve what he expects of himself brings self-disesteem and shame. ¹⁵⁶

A man may feel the loss of self-regard even where his dishonourable conduct, or personal inadequacy, is unlikely to become known to others. But more often than not self-regard also has an external point of reference. A man is constantly anxious as to how his actions and qualities will appear

¹ Although the Sarakatsani use the adjective *φιλότιμος* to describe a person who 'loves honour', they do not use the substantive *τὸ φιλότιμο*, 'a sense' of this honour, which is a concept of popular thought extremely common in many parts of Greece. It is clear, however, that *ἐγωισμός* is a close analogue. [195]